REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-72 stand rejected as being obvious over *Peinado et al.* in view of *Rabin et al.* Claims 73-75 stand rejected as being obvious over *Peinado et al.* in view of *Rabin et al.* and further in view of *Luchenbaugh et al.*

Independent claims 1 and 37 have been amended to recite more clearly the novel aspects of the invention. In particular, the amended claims more clearly recite that the security module is a client side module and separate from the rendering engine. Also, the amended claims recite that the security module intercepts requests to the rendering engine, determines if the request is for protected content and enforces usage rights only if the request is for protected content. Additionally, dependent claims 5 and 41 have been amended to recite that the security module is deactivated if it is determined that the request is not for protected content. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs 65-67 of the application as originally filed.

Thus, independent claims 1, and 37 include the novel features of a security module which is downloaded to and included in a client computer, the security module being adapted to be attached to the standard application program for enforcing security conditions, and wherein the security module determines if a request is for protected content and enforces usage rights only when the request is for protected content.

By contrast, the combination of cited references fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 37. For example, the "security modules" in each of *Peinado et al.* and *Rabin et al.* are not client side components that are separate from the rendering engine. Also, as noted in the previous response, one of skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the references as posited by the Examiner.

Further, it is clear that the intent of *Rabin et al.* is to regulate *all access to the software*. By contrast, the invention of independent claims 1 and 37 is directed to limiting access to content, for example, only if/when it is operating on content that is protected because the security module deactivates when a request is not for protected content, as recited in claims 5 and 41. This type of selective enforcement based on content, which is being processed, is also not disclosed by *Peinado et al.* and *Rabin et al.*, taken alone or in combination.

The present invention recited in independent claims 1, and 37, permits a standard rendering engine to be used for protected content while minimizing use of computing resources.

By contrast, *Peinado et al.* and *Rabin et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the noted features recited in independent claims 1, and 37, nor recognize or address the discovered problems with conventional DRM systems.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

/Marc Kaufman, Reg. # 35,212/
Marc Kaufman
Reg. No.35,212

Date: **September 21, 2007**

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080